UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,670	01/26/2004	Jean-Yves Simon	TI-36989	9476

23494   7590   09/02/2008
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER
ALPHONSE, FRITZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2112	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/02/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com
uspto@dlemail.itg.ti.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 May 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed on 5/20/2008. Claims 1-23 are

pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing

to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the

invention.

        As to claim 1, it is not clear to what is meant by the limitation "the storing while

transferring the data block."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16, 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Eggleston (U.S. Pat. No. 6,906,961) in view of Wei (U. S. Pat. No. 6,683,817) and further

in view of Ito (US. Pub. 2004/0221098 A1).

        As to claim 6, Eggleston (figs. 1-3) shows a system (134), including a flash memory (100); a

controller (130) coupled to the flash memory (100); and at least one register (128/114) coupled

to the controller (130).

Eggleston differs from claim 6 in that he does not explicitly disclose "a controller is configured to shift a data block between the flash memory and the controller while computing an ECC for said data block."

However, the limitation is obvious and well known in the art, as evidenced by Wei (See figure 2a; col. 5, lines 58 through col. 6 line 14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to incorporate Eggleston's flash memory device into the electronic circuit, as disclosed by Wei. Doing so would provide improved data transfer for the NAND Flash memory and which can furthermore assure data integrity (col. 2, lines 5-8).

In addition, as to claim 6, Eggleston does not explicitly disclose a switch coupled to a controller and a system that stores the ECC in a plurality of registers using a switch, while the controller shifts the data block. However, the limitations are obvious and well known in the art, as evidenced by Ito (see fig. 6; paragraph 0143).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to improve upon the semiconductor integrated circuit device, as disclosed by Ito. Doing so would provide an IC circuit comprising an ECC controller for controlling and ECC circuit under control of a control logic.

As to claims 7-10, Eggleston discloses a system, wherein the flash memory is a NAND Flash memory (col. 5, lines 40-49); the system stores a first portion of the ECC in a first register; and storing a second portion of the ECC in an alternate register if the first register is full (fig. 8; col. 16, lines 45 through col. 17 line 5). Eggleston discloses a system, wherein the controller transfers contents of all registers to memory (col. 16, lines 9-30).

As to claim 1, method claim 1 corresponds to apparatus claim 6; therefore, it is analyzed as previously discussed in claim 6 above.

As to claims 2-4, Eggleston (fig. 8 A-B) discloses a method, comprising: storing a first portion of the ECC in a first register; and storing a second portion of the ECC in a second register if the first register is full (col. 16, lines 31-66).

As to claim 12, Eggleston discloses a system comprising: a means for storing a data block (i.e., flash memory 100); a means for transferring a data block (i.e., controller 130).

Eggleston does not explicitly teach means for simultaneously computing an ECC of the data block; means for shifting the data block between the means for storing and means for controlling while computing an ECC for said data block.

However, the limitation is obvious and very well known in the art, as evidenced by Kikuchi (figs. 2, 11, col. 16, lines 30-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to improve upon the memory device, as disclosed by Kikuchi. Doing so would provide a split data error correction code circuit to generate on ECC code from user data.

In addition, as to claim 12, Eggleston does not explicitly disclose means for selectively storing the ECC in a plurality of registers using a switch, while shifting the data block. However, the limitations are obvious and well known in the art, as evidenced by Ito (see fig. 6; paragraph 0143).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to improve upon the semiconductor integrated circuit device, as disclosed by Ito.

Doing so would provide an IC circuit comprising an ECC controller for controlling and ECC circuit under control of a control logic.

As to claims 13-16, Eggleston discloses a system, wherein the flash memory is a NAND Flash memory (col. 5, lines 40-49); the means for selectively storing the ECC is configured to stores a first portion of the ECC in a first register; and storing a second portion of the ECC in an alternate register if the first register is full (fig. 8; col. 16, lines 45 through col. 17 line 5). Eggleston discloses a system, wherein the controller transfers contents of all registers to memory (col. 16, lines 9-30).

As to claims 18-19, the claims have substantially the limitations of claims 6 and 10; therefore, they are analyzed as previously discussed in claims 6 and 10 above.

As to claims 20-23 Eggleston discloses a system, wherein the flash memory is a NAND Flash memory (col. 5, lines 40-49); the means for selectively storing the ECC is configured to stores a first portion of the ECC in a first register; and storing a second portion of the ECC in an alternate register if the first register is full (fig. 8; col. 16, lines 45 through col. 17 line 5). Eggleston discloses a system, wherein the controller transfers contents of all registers to memory (col. 16, lines 9-30).

As to claims 24-26, Eggleston discloses a system, wherein the registers (224-228) are in the controllers.

6.   Claims 5, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggleston and Wei in view of Ito, and further in view of Acton (U.S. Pat. No. 6,883,131).

As to claims 5, 11 and 17, Eggleston and Kikuchi do not disclose a system, wherein the controller is configured to compute the ECC while performing the Exclusive-OR function.

However, the limitation is obvious and well known in the art, as evidenced by Acton (col. 7, lines 30-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to improve upon the data processing system, as disclosed by Acton. By doing so, a different error correction code may be used which provides double-bit or greater error correction capability.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed on 5/20/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8.   Applicant argues that "Ito does not teach storing ECC in a plurality of registers while transferring the data block."

The examiner asserts that Eggleston discloses a system, wherein the flash memory is a NAND Flash memory (see col. 5, lines 40-49); the system stores a first portion of the ECC in a first register; and storing a second portion of the ECC in an alternate register if the first register is full (fig. 8; col. 16, lines 45 through col. 17 line 5). Eggleston's system includes a controller which transfers contents of the registers to the memory (col. 16, lines 9-30).

Applicant argues that Eggleston, Wei and Ito still fail to teach or fairly suggest "computing an ECC for said data block while transferring the data block; and selectively storing the ECC in a plurality of registers using a switching mechanism, the storing while transferring the data block."

In that regard, the examiner respectfully asserts that Eggleston does not explicitly teach computing an ECC of the data block; storing the ECC in a plurality of registers. However, the limitations are disclosed by Kikuchi (figs. 2, 11, col. 16, lines 30-41).

Applicant argues that Eggleston and Kikuchi still fail to teach or fairly suggest "a means for shifting the data block between the means for storing and the means for controlling while computing an ECC for said data block; and a means for selectively storing the ECC in a plurality of registers while shifting the data block."

Conclusion

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.   Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.   See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fritz Alphonse, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3813. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-6:00, Alt. Mondays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jacques Louis-Jacques, can be reached at (571) 272-6962.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3824

Information regarding the status of an application may also be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Fritz Alphonse/

Art Unit 2112

8/25/2008

/JACQUES H LOUIS-JACQUES/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2100